



**Bicycle/Pedestrian
Advisory
Committee
of the
Metropolitan
Planning
Organization
for the
Miami Urbanized
Area**

Chairman
Ted Silver

Members
Brett Bibeau

Sheila Boyce

Dr. Barry Burak

Amado Leon

Susan Smith

Contact Information

David Henderson,
Bicycle/Pedestrian
Coordinator
davidh@miamidade.gov

Miami-Dade MPO
111 NW First St., #910
Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-4507
(fax) 305-375-4950

www.miamidade.gov/mpo



BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SOUTH MIAMI COMMISSION CHAMBERS
6130 SUNSET DRIVE
SOUTH MIAMI, FLORIDA

A G E N D A

**MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2004
AT 7 P.M.**

- I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
 - MEETING OF JUNE 23, 2004
- III. MEMBER COMMENTS
- IV. PRESENTATIONS
 - A. LIVABLE COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE – J. Seitlin, FDOT
 - B. BAYLINK UPDATE – W. Fernandez, MPO
 - C. 2030 LRP PRELIMINARY CRITERIA REVIEW – D. Henderson
- V. DISCUSSION ITEMS
 - A. BIKE & RIDE – B. Bibeau
 - B. TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT PRIORITIZATION – D. Henderson
 - C. GO BOND UPDATE – D. Henderson
- VI. INFORMATION ITEMS
 - A. M-D PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT UPDATES – J. Cohen, MDPW
 - B. APRIL - JUNE PROGRESS REPORT – J. Manzella

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2004

MEMBERS PRESENT

Brett Bibeau
Susan Kairalla

Sheila Boyce
Ted Silver

Barry Burak

MEMBERS ABSENT

Amado Leon
Susan Smith

OTHERS PRESENT

David Henderson, Staff
Janet Seitlan, FDOT

Jae Manzella, Staff
Kevin Tilbury, Renaissance Planning Group

Wilson Fernandez, MPO
Lubby Navarro, School Brd.

The meeting began at 7:13 p.m.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	- TS: <i>Preferred Member Comments placed after all other topics on the Agenda.</i> DH: <i>Asked to move the Baylink presentation first.</i>
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	- SB: <i>Motion to approve Minutes of June 23, 2004; seconded by SK; vote – unanimous.</i>
BAYLINK UPDATE	- WF: (Along with a slideshow.) He is presenting the “preferred local alternative”. In September 2003, the MPO adopted a loop system from Downtown Miami to South Beach. Streetcars were the chosen vehicle type by the MPO. <i>They will link to Metrorail at Government Ctr.</i> This system should be more reliable than buses. Both areas are experiencing tremendous growth, presently and in the future. <i>Other extensions would be added, as needed.</i> FTA is planned to formally approve the project for federal (50%), state, and local (PTP tax) funding. The earliest date for implementation would be 2012; however, the MPO’s priority projects lists Baylink in 2023. Many tasks need to be accomplished before then. <i>An extensive public involvement process will be in place throughout, including an existing Baylink Advisory Committee. The route will be double-tracked in Downtown Miami, and run 1-way (counter clockwise) in South Beach. A 2nd circulator in South Beach would provide a complimentary (clockwise) route. This route also would serve the South Pointe and Dade Blvd. areas.</i> In South Beach, median stations are planned. <i>Streetcars would mix with other vehicular traffic, with tracks embedded in the road.</i> The City of Miami is planning their own streetcar line along 2 nd Av. <i>The two design groups will coordinate closely to avoid excessive stations and ensure alignment compatibility.</i> Less infrastructure is required for streetcars, as apposed to light-rail, etc.; ensuring shorter construction periods to disrupt traffic. However, it also means less passengers would be served per run in this high-travel area. <i>In Miami, every other streetcar would operate either clockwise or counter-clockwise.</i> One extension possibility is to the Port of Miami. <i>Effective headways would be less than 5 minutes, and no more than 10. Most stations in Miami would be curb-side. Some would be 28’ long and 12’ wide, with seating and fare-vending machines. At AA Arena, the station would be configured to accommodate 2 streetcars; so that during events, a streetcar would always be queued to pick-up passengers; and, as the next one pulls-up, proceed. The Watson Island station would be elevated (due to physical restraints), with a pedestrian bridge crossing the causeway to/from Parrot Jungle. A presentation will be made to the MPO Board, and he expects them to reassess the priorities of the Long Range Plan, as well as formally adopt the project later. MDT will take-on the rest of the (PD&E) project, once these actions are done. Median stations in South Beach would have a small rise, and accommodate “level boarding”, as well as minimized canopies,</i>

	<p>so as not to be intrusive to the local architecture. Maps, seating, and artistic lighting are proposed. <i>An honor system would be introduced, so riders will pay prior to boarding.</i> Station design options were presented to the public. Stations in Miami would probably be different from those in South Beach. These vehicles are planned to replace most of the buses traveling to South Beach; and <i>stations would be further spaced apart than existing bus stops.</i> Other vehicles could travel in the streetcar lanes. Approximately 500 bus trips would be replaced.</p> <p>TS: Inquired what is being considered to accommodate the 1000 potential Bike&Ride passengers that would be displaced.</p> <p>WF: It is too early to be sure; however, existing similar systems accommodate bicycles inside the vehicles. <i>This would be specified at the PD&E stage, at the end of the FEIS.</i></p> <p>TS: Inquired if the final report of the study could make notation that bicycles are to be accommodated within each stage of development, including the choice of the vehicles.</p> <p>WF: This can be done; however, the FEIS is the official document signed by all parties.</p> <p>TS: Bicycle accommodations must be included within any document to recognize this mode as an intricate part of the transit system. There should be no trade-off of existing service. Inquired as to the alignment along MacArthur Cswy.</p> <p>WF: <i>Streetcars would run south of the jersey barrier</i> (above the rock shoreline). Existing bus-bays will be impacted; but there shouldn't be an impact to the paved shoulders. If demand shows, 2nd cars could be added, (total length - 160'). He cannot guarantee that bicycles will be accommodated within the streetcars; however, <i>it will be mentioned in his report.</i> The BPAC would have to ensure it is within the FEIS. <i>The consultant selection would be complete by the end of the year. Their work would take 12-18 months.</i></p> <p>TS: Inquired which agency would be responsible for specifying which features will be included in the streetcar designs.</p> <p>WF: MDT.</p> <p>TS: <i>Requested WF to notify DH when MDT takes over the project.</i></p> <p>DH: Concerned with the potential for cyclists to get their wheels stuck in the tracks.</p> <p>WF: There is also the concern when a streetcar is at a station. Some existing systems route cyclists behind the stations.</p> <p>TS: <i>This issue should be reviewed and propagated throughout the design process.</i></p> <p>JM: There should be a way to minimize the track-gap, similar to some R/R crossings.</p> <p>DH: Inquired if existing sidewalk space would be impacted.</p> <p>WF: <i>In some areas, yes.</i> He considered the impact to be minimal.</p> <p>SK: Where bike paths exist along the route, these facilities must not be compromised. Inquired if boardings could be at any point along the route, similar to San Francisco.</p> <p>WF: <i>Passengers would board at stations.</i> The San Francisco Bay area has tremendous congestion, except in the downtown area; where the public has learned to leave their personal vehicles, in lieu of an efficient transit service. This is the objective of Baylink.</p>
LIVABLE COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE	<p>- JS: This project focuses on the philosophy and direction which FDOT will be tackling in the future. In 20 years, it will be less desirable for personal automobile use, due to congestion. As areas are redeveloped, the intent is to redesign them, allowing for walkable/bikeable trip destinations and transit connections. Several presentations are being made throughout the county to let the public become more familiar with the principals involved. Guidelines are being developed to aid municipalities.</p> <p>SK: There is a lot of need for safe walking routes to school.</p> <p>JS: Although this is included in the basic principals, there is also a separate project to</p>

improve these routes; as well as creating a curriculum to educate children on safety. Other activities include neighborhood charrettes and various safety programs.

KT: His Orlando firm focuses upon integrated transportation linkages. The FDOT has finally recognized that their primary objective is moving people, rather than motor vehicles. They have expanded their perception to review projects more on impacts of quality of life of communities, striking a balance between mobility and livability. There are trade-offs to consider, for examples: the vertical clearance for motor vehicles and the inclusion of landscaping as a buffer zone for users of the sidewalk; or simply vehicle space versus pedestrian space within a corridor. The Livable Communities Corridor Studies are the 1st of their kind in Florida. FDOT partnerships with various agencies to review various corridors' livability and determine steps to improve them. The 1st study was SR 934 (79/82 Sts. pair) in Miami; and as a 2nd phase, the causeway to/from Miami Beach. Another is the Miami Springs area, which will be impacted by the MIC project. In another, the City of Miami requested a review of the reconstruction project along Brickell Av., in order to create more pedestrian buffers. Last year, there were several workshops for local governments on how to coordinate more closely with the FDOT. Human scale plays a big part in livable communities. For SR 934, the present design is a high-speed corridor from Miami Beach to I-95, running through an emerging community. Along 79th St, the City would like to redevelop this corridor to reflect it's role as a main street for the area. The results of several meetings call for *82nd St to become a local corridor, reintroducing 2-way travel, and shifting most traffic to 79th St.* This would take it off the State Road System. There would also be sufficient R-O-W to install bike lanes, which addresses policy directives to provide a choice of travel modes. *Trees/streetscapes will be installed as well. On-street parking will create more of a buffer zone.* Presently, 79th St has no clearly-defined right-hand lane; *the proposals would correct that.*

BBurak: Taking away on-street parking will be counter-productive.

KT: The City would be responsible for developing off-street parking lots. This is another example of the trade-offs. Enhancements would also include: medians (to stop people from crossing at inappropriate places; and improved crosswalks, possibly mid-block where warranted. Continuing further east along the causeway, there is enough R-O-W for a path, which would provide a connection to Pelican Pk. In North Bay Village, R-O-W is reduced, but lane reductions may allow wider sidewalks/buffer zones. An alternate route for cyclists may be through the neighborhood to the south, leading to/from the school.

JM: The design being shown seems to have excessive sidewalk widths, (approx. 11'); especially since there is another 4' of landscaped buffer. Narrowing them down to provide (at least) wide curb-lanes would better accommodate roadway cyclists.

KT: Travel lanes are being proposed at 11' with 18" gutters.

TS: There may not be enough space for dedicated bike lanes; but, they aren't the only way to accommodate roadway cycling. Marked shoulders keep motor vehicles separated from where cyclists are supposed to travel. This is a compromise.

KT: The mainland portion is in PD&E phase. This portion is not; it will be given to another consultant team for design. It would be good to have them at a BPAC meeting.

TS: Decisions were made when drawing this design. *He would rather have a redesign of the typical section, before it gets to the design phase.*

DH: Inquired if the FDOT BLOS is being used during the analysis process.

KT: Yes. The new Multi-Modal LOS is used, which incorporates the BLOS.

DH: This should quantify the benefits of various designs.

		<p>KT: This study was completed 1 ½ years ago.</p> <p>JS: She is taking notes that will be passed on to the PD&E team.</p> <p>TS: <i>There needs to be better cooperation with all study teams to make attempts to present projects to the BPAC in a timely manner.</i></p> <p>SB: <i>Would like the mainland-portion design team to meet with the BPAC.</i></p> <p>JS: Some R-O-W problems have to be resolved before the project goes further.</p> <p>SB: <i>Continuity of accommodations must be ensured beyond these specific projects, once opportunities come about.</i> Small bike lane segments do not create an effective system.</p> <p>KT: Another feature of livable communities are reduced turning radii at intersections.</p> <p>JS: Wondered where in the timeline the BPAC should be given a presentation. <i>She will be forming a focus group to determine these timeline actions.</i></p> <p>KT: The 30% phase seems appropriate. Designs haven't been finalized then.</p> <p>JM: Kennedy Cswy. is a crucial linkage, since the Tuttle is off-limits. There are a lot of cyclists in North Beach.</p> <p>KT: Potential for more cycling is high, if accommodations were better. The existing Normandy Isle roadway handles more capacity than necessary. <i>The study team suggests eliminating a lane to provide bike lanes & a wide sidewalk for less-experienced cyclists.</i></p> <p>DH: That is actually a myth; it's harder to maneuver along a sidewalk with pedestrian conflicts, intersections and driveways than a bike lane. Sight-limitations are a problem.</p> <p>KT: Agrees. Since the City invested a lot of money already to redesign the North Beach Town Ctr. area, the Study team is not suggesting change, <i>except for mid-block crossings, landscaped medians and bulb-outs.</i></p> <p>JM: Considered it inappropriate to provide mid-block crossings in this area, due to the traffic congestion and small block sizes.</p> <p>[NOTE: DUE TO ERROR - THE TAPE DISCUSSION WAS ERASED AT THIS POINT.]</p> <p>KT: (Discussing a project to link facilities along Sunset Dr. where there is a gap.) The plan is to provide a 10' sidewalk in this area, as well as continuing the path to the Palmetto Expwy. There is limited funding for this work.</p> <p>DH: Breaking-up on-street parking with landscaping provides a more inviting environment. He prefers none or minimal landscaped medians, to provide added buffer along sidewalks. Traffic volumes on 72 St in North Beach do not warrant bike lanes. Transitioning from paths to bike lanes, to shared lanes, to other corridors, etc. is not recommended. <i>An attempt should be made to make the eastern-most part of 71 St. more bike-friendly; which at the least could include slower speeds & "Share the Road" signs.</i></p> <p>JM: There is plenty of R-O-W on 72 St to provide for a wide sidewalk (path) on the park-side. This would benefit many visitors of the park.</p> <p>KT: Bike lanes were the recommendation of the City, part of a complete street redesign.</p> <p>DH: He relies on Ken Jeffries, FDOT's Bicycle Coordinator to alert him of projects the BPAC should be reviewing. <i>He will put JS on the BPAC mail list. He would like to be put on her mail list, so he may notify members of her meetings.</i></p> <p>JM: It is encouraging that the FDOT District VI is enhancing their focus on b/p issues.</p>
TRANSPORT- ATION ENHANCE- MENT	-	<p>DH: The TE program is federally funded for non-traditional transportation projects, such as: bicycle, pedestrian, landscaping, preservation of historical structures, scenic easements, etc. Every year, the MPO solicits applications; this year 9 were received, (1 was disqualified). <i>There is \$3 ½ million for these projects.</i> The public (via BPAC,</p>

PROGRAM PROJECT PRIORITIZ- ATION	<p>CTAC, & TARC) is provided a chance to prioritize them. The MPO then approves/changes the compiled list and submits it to the FDOT.</p> <p>TS: Inquired about the 3 Greenway Bridges project.</p> <p>DH: One is at Black Creek Point to avert using the existing Marina bridge (driveway). This coincides with a path from the marina to L&P Thompson Pk. The 2nd is a connection along North Canal Dr. to Homestead Bayfront Pk. The 3rd is along Black Creek, just east of US-1 to connect South Dade Govt. Ctr. to a proposed cultural center.</p> <p>TS: Several South Dade Trail Riders voiced support for this project at another meeting. Inquired about the relationship between the North Beach East-West Connector project and what was just discussed with the Livable Communities consultant.</p> <p>DH: The 72 St. portion is part of that. The City has identified east-west streets to link neighborhoods to recreational areas. He would have preferred traffic studies to better identify which streets to include. The North Miami Beach Snake Creek project would connect the existing path to Oleta River State Recreation Area, via bike lanes on NE 163 St. They are not proposing a local match.</p> <p>TS: Oleta is a great regional destination. Getting cyclists to/from the park is vital.</p> <p>DH: A related project is on the other end of the existing Snake Creek path, running it west to NW 47 Av., passing Pro Player Stadium. Funding for the Galloway Rd. project doesn't include funds for interpretive signage as planned; so the Parks Dept. is requesting more funds to do so, as well as to develop signage guidelines for future projects.</p>
2030 LRP PRELIMINARY REVIEW	<p>DH: (Handed out a map depicting the consultant's identified trail needs and preliminary evaluation criteria regarding the 2030 LRP review.) <i>Other materials, such as preliminary priorities should be available by the August meeting.</i></p> <p>SB: She and TS attended a LRP public meeting.</p> <p>TS: No other citizens were present.</p> <p>SB: There was an interesting discussion on how to get more of the public involved.</p>
BIKE & RIDE	<p>- B.Bibeau: (Quoting from a June 24th <u>New Times</u> article.) A Broward man, using Bike & Ride regularly to work in Miami-Dade, is getting passed-up by bus drivers. He contends they don't want to be delayed; but since congestion is bad already, it's unjustified. This has happened at least 4 times in 1 month alone. His complaints have not been addressed.</p> <p>DH: He spoke to an MDT – Complaints/Comments representative. She said the cyclist was able to catch-up to the bus at another stop and board it. The bus driver claimed he didn't see him the 1st time. MDT tracks these complaints, links them to drivers and identifies problematic drivers for disciplinary actions. A timely complaint with bus numbers, dates, times, etc. is very important.</p> <p>BBibeau: Although the cyclist was able to board the bus after catching-up with it, there were at least 3 other incidences. Also, no one from MDT called him back. <i>Requested a follow-up for next month's meeting, with copies of the complaints and an MDT staff member attending. He will be contacting the cyclist to attend as well.</i> This is a great program, but it needs to be consistent.</p> <p>TS: <i>Would prefer to have the MDT representative attend first, to avoid a possible confrontation with the cyclist present.</i></p> <p>BBibeau: <i>The cyclist should, at the least, be notified.</i> These are public meetings.</p>
PUBLIC WORKS UPDATE	<p>- BBibeau: Disappointed the Public Works liaison has not provided the timeline for the Rickenbacker Cswy., requested from last month.</p>

- *The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.*